

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action in the present application. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to the Information Disclosure Statement filed on May 14, 2001. A new Information Disclosure Statement has previously been filed.

The specification is objected to as not containing an abstract of the disclosure. An abstract of the disclosure has been submitted to overcome the objection.

Claims 1-8 and 11-15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Lee et al. Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. and further in view of Hamilton, Jr. et al.

Applicant expresses his appreciation to Examiner Otilia Gabor for the courtesy of an interview which was granted to Applicants' representative, Sanford T. Colb (Reg. No. 26,856). The interview was held in the USPTO on September 17, 2003.

In the interview, claim 1 was discussed vis-à-vis the prior art rejections. The Interview Summary Record states, in relevant part, "The Applicant's suggestion of including that the blocking layer is permissive of ionizing radiation was considered as a distinguishing limitation over the prior art Lee (US 5,648,660)."

Applicant has accordingly amended independent claim 1 to include the recitation of "an ionizing radiation transmissive blocking layer exposed to ionizing radiation and optical radiation, overlying said ionizing radiation sensitive layer."

None of the prior art references shows or suggests "an ionizing radiation transmissive blocking layer exposed to ionizing radiation and optical radiation, overlying said ionizing radiation sensitive layer" as claimed in amended independent claim 1.

With reference to the above discussion, claim 1 is deemed patentable over the prior art of record and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 2-15 depend directly or ultimately from claim 1 and recite additional patentable

subject matter and therefore are deemed patentable a fortiori.


Claims 16-52 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Applicant reserves the right to pursue the claims as filed in the context of a continuation application.

In view of the foregoing, all of the claims are deemed to be allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 13, 2003



Patrick F. Bright,
Reg. No. 24,318
BRIGHT & LORIG, P.C.
633 West 5th St., Ste 3330
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel: 213.627.7774
Fax: 213.627.8508
pbright@brightlorig.com